arXiv:1210.3670v2 [math.AP] 29 Dec 2012

On Spherically Symmetric Motions of the Atmosphere Surrounding a Planet Governed by the Compressible Euler Equations

Tetu Makino

submetita la 13an Oktobro 2012,
revizita la 31an Decembro 2012

Abstract

We consider spherically symmetric motions of inviscid compressible gas surrounding a solid ball under the gravity of the core. Equilibria touch the vacuum with finite radii, and the linearized equation around one of the equilibria has time-periodic solutions. To justify the linearization, we should construct true solutions for which this time-periodic solution plus the equilibrium is the first approximation. But this leads us to difficulty caused by singularities at the free boundary touching the vacuum. We solve this problem by the Nash-Moser theorem.

Key Words and Phrases. Compressible Euler equations, Spherically symmetric solutions, Vacuum boundary, Nash-Moser theorem

2010 Mathematics Subject Classification Numbers. 35L65, 35L05, 35L72

1 Introduction

We consider spherically symmetric motions of atmosphere governed by the compressible Euler equations:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{\partial \rho}{\partial t}+u\frac{\partial \rho}{\partial r}+\rho\frac{\partial u}{\partial r}+\frac{2}{r}\rho u=0,\\
&\rho\Big(\frac{\partial u}{\partial t}+u\frac{\partial u}{\partial r}\Big)+\frac{\partial P}{\partial r}=-\frac{g_0\rho}{r^2}\quad (R_0\leq r)
\end{aligned}\tag{1}$$

and the boundary value condition

$$\rho u|_{r=R_0} = 0. \tag{2}$$

Here ρ is the density, u the velocity, P the pressure. $R_0(>0)$ is the radius of the central solid ball, and $g_0 = G_0M_0$, G_0 being the gravitational constant, M_0 the mass of the central ball. The self-gravity of the atmosphere is neglected.

In this study we always assume that

$$P = A\rho^\gamma, \tag{3}$$

where A and γ are positive constants, and we assume that $1 < \gamma \leq 2$.

Equilibria of the problem are given by

$$\bar{\rho}(r) = \begin{cases} A_1\Big(\dfrac{1}{r} - \dfrac{1}{R}\Big)^{\frac{1}{\gamma-1}} & (R_0 \leq r < R) \\ 0 & (R \leq r), \end{cases}$$

where R is an arbitrary number such that $R > R_0$ and

$$A_1 = \Big(\frac{(\gamma-1)g_0}{\gamma A}\Big)^{\frac{1}{\gamma-1}}.$$

Remark: The total mass M of the equilibrium is given by

$$M = 4\pi A_1 \int_{R_0}^{R} \Big(\frac{1}{r} - \frac{1}{R}\Big)^{\frac{1}{\gamma-1}} r^2 dr.$$

M is an increasing function of R. Of course $M \to 0$ as $R \to R_0$. But as $R \to +\infty$, we see

$$M \to 4\pi A_1 \int_{R_0}^{\infty} r^{\frac{2\gamma-3}{\gamma-1}} dr = \begin{cases} +\infty & \text{if } \gamma \geq 4/3 \\ M^*(<\infty) & \text{if } \gamma < 4/3, \end{cases}$$

where

$$M^* = \frac{4\pi A_1(\gamma-1)}{4-3\gamma} R_0^{-\frac{4-3\gamma}{\gamma-1}}.$$

Hence if $\gamma \geq 4/3$ there is an equilibrium for any given total mass, but if $\gamma < 4/3$ the possible mass have the upper boud M^*.

Let us fix one of these equilibria. We are interested in motions around this equilibrium. The major difficulty of the analysis comes from the free boundary touching the vacuum, which can move along time. So it is convenient to introduce the Lagrangian mass coordinate

$$m = 4\pi \int_{R_0}^{r} \rho(t, r')r'^2 dr',$$

to fix the interval of independent variable to consider. Taking m as the independent variable instead of r, the equations turn out to be

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{\partial \rho}{\partial t} + 4\pi\rho^2 \frac{\partial}{\partial m}(r^2 u) = 0, \\ &\frac{\partial u}{\partial t} + 4\pi r^2 \frac{\partial P}{\partial m} = -\frac{g_0}{r^2} \qquad (0 < m < M), \end{aligned}$$

where

$$r = \Big(R_0 + \frac{3}{4\pi}\int_0^m \frac{dm}{\rho}\Big)^{1/3}.$$

We note that

$$\frac{\partial r}{\partial t} = u, \qquad \frac{\partial r}{\partial m} = \frac{1}{4\pi r^2 \rho}.$$

Let us take $\bar{r} = \bar{r}(m)$ as the independent variable instead of m, where $\bar{r}(m)$ is the inverse function of

$$\bar{m}(r) = 4\pi \int_{R_0}^{r} \bar{\rho}(r')r'^2 dr'.$$

Then, since

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial m} = \frac{1}{4\pi\bar{r}^2\bar{\rho}}\frac{\partial}{\partial \bar{r}}, \qquad \rho = \Big(4\pi r^2 \frac{\partial r}{\partial m}\Big)^{-1} = \bar{\rho}\Big(\frac{r^2}{\bar{r}^2}\frac{\partial r}{\partial \bar{r}}\Big)^{-1},$$

we have a single second-order equation

$$\frac{\partial^2 r}{\partial t^2} + \frac{1}{\bar{\rho}}\frac{r^2}{\bar{r}^2}\frac{\partial}{\partial \bar{r}}\Big(\bar{P}\Big(\frac{r^2}{\bar{r}^2}\frac{\partial r}{\partial \bar{r}}\Big)^{-\gamma}\Big) + \frac{g_0}{r^2} = 0.$$

The variable $\bar{r}$ runs on the interval $[R_0, R]$ and the boundary condition is

$$r|_{\bar{r}=R_0} = R_0.$$

Without loss of generality, we can and shall asume that

$$R_0 = 1, \quad g_0 = \frac{1}{\gamma - 1}, \quad A = \frac{1}{\gamma}, \quad A_1 = 1.$$

Keeping in mind that the equilibrium satisfies

$$\frac{1}{\bar{\rho}} \frac{\partial \bar{P}}{\partial \bar{r}} + \frac{g_0}{\bar{r}^2} = 0,$$

we have

$$\frac{\partial^2 r}{\partial t^2} - \frac{1}{\bar{\rho}} \frac{r^2}{\bar{r}^2} \frac{\partial}{\partial \bar{r}} \Big(\bar{P} \Big(1 - \Big(\frac{r^2}{\bar{r}^2} \frac{\partial r}{\partial \bar{r}} \Big)^{-\gamma} \Big) \Big) + \frac{1}{\gamma - 1} \Big(\frac{1}{r^2} - \frac{r^2}{\bar{r}^4} \Big) = 0.$$

Introducing the unknown variable y for perturbation by

$$r = \bar{r}(1 + y), \tag{4}$$

we can write the equation as

$$\frac{\partial^2 y}{\partial t^2} - \frac{1}{\rho r}(1 + y)^2 \frac{\partial}{\partial r} \Big(PG \Big(y, r \frac{\partial y}{\partial r} \Big) \Big) - \frac{1}{\gamma - 1} \frac{1}{r^3} H(y) = 0, \tag{5}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} G(y, v) &:= 1 - (1 + y)^{-2\gamma} (1 + y + v)^{-\gamma} = \gamma(3y + v) + [y, v]_2, \\ H(y) &:= (1 + y)^2 - \frac{1}{(1 + y)^2} = 4y + [y]_2 \end{aligned}$$

and we have used the abbreviations r, ρ, P for $\bar{r}, \bar{\rho}, \bar{P}$.

Notational Remark: Here and hereafter $[X]_q$ denotes a convergent power series, or an analytic function given by the series, of the form $\sum_{j \geq q} a_j X^j$, and $[X, Y]_q$ stands for a convergent double power series of the form $\sum_{j+k \geq q} a_{jk} X^j Y^k$.

We are going to study the equation (5) on $1 < r < R$ with the boundary condition

$$y|_{r=1} = 0.$$

Of course y and $r\frac{\partial y}{\partial r}$ will be confined to

$$|y| + \left|r\frac{\partial y}{\partial r}\right| < 1.$$

2 Analysis of the linearized problem

2.1

The linearization of the equation (5) is clearly

$$\frac{\partial^2 y}{\partial t^2} + \mathcal{L}y = 0, \tag{6}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{L}y &:= -\frac{1}{\rho r}\frac{d}{dr}\Big(P\gamma\Big(3y + r\frac{dy}{dr}\Big)\Big) - \frac{1}{\gamma-1}\frac{1}{r^3}(4y) \\ &= -\Big(\frac{1}{r} - \frac{1}{R}\Big)\frac{d^2y}{dr^2} + \Big(-\frac{4}{r}\Big(\frac{1}{r} - \frac{1}{R}\Big) + \frac{\gamma}{\gamma-1}\frac{1}{r^2}\Big)\frac{dy}{dr} + \frac{3\gamma-4}{\gamma-1}\frac{y}{r^3}. \end{aligned}\tag{7}$$

Let us consider the eigenvalue problem

$$\mathcal{L}y = \lambda y.$$

We introduce the independent variable z by

$$z = \frac{R-r}{R} \tag{8}$$

and the parameter N by

$$\frac{\gamma}{\gamma-1} = \frac{N}{2} \quad \text{or} \quad \gamma = 1 + \frac{2}{N-2}. \tag{9}$$

Then we can write

$$R^3\mathcal{L}y = -\frac{z}{1-z}\frac{d^2y}{dz^2} - \frac{\frac{N}{2} - 4z}{(1-z)^2}\frac{dy}{dz} + \frac{8-N}{2}\frac{1}{(1-z)^3}y \tag{10}$$

The variable z runs over the inetrval $[0, 1-\frac{1}{R}]$, the boundary $z=0$ corresponds to the free boundary touching the vacuum, and the boundary condition at $z = 1-\frac{1}{R}$ is the Dirichlet condition $y=0$.

2.2

Although the boundary $z = 1 - \frac{1}{R}$ is regular, the boundary $z = 0$ is singular. In order to analyze the singularity, we transform the equation $\mathcal{L}y = \lambda y$, which can be written as

$$-z\frac{d^2y}{dz^2} - \Big(\frac{N}{2}\frac{1}{1-z} - \frac{4z}{1-z}\Big)\frac{dy}{dz} + \frac{8-N}{2}\frac{y}{(1-z)^2} = \lambda R^3(1-z)y,$$

to an equation of the formally self-adjoint form

$$-\frac{d}{dz}p(z)\frac{dy}{dz} + q(z)y = \lambda R^3\mu(z)y.$$

This can be done by putting

$$\begin{aligned} p &= z^{\frac{N}{2}}(1-z)^{\frac{8-N}{2}}, \\ q &= \frac{8-N}{2}z^{\frac{N-2}{2}}(1-z)^{\frac{4-N}{2}}, \\ \mu &= z^{\frac{N-2}{2}}(1-z)^{\frac{10-N}{2}}. \end{aligned}$$

Using the Liouville transformation, we convert the equation

$$-\frac{d}{dz}p(z)\frac{dy}{dz} + q(z)y = \lambda R^3\mu(z)y + f$$

to the standard form

$$-\frac{d^2\eta}{d\xi^2} + Q\eta = \lambda R^3\eta + \hat{f}.$$

This can be done by putting

$$\begin{aligned} \xi &= \int_0^z \sqrt{\frac{\mu}{p}}dz = \int_0^z \sqrt{\frac{1-\zeta}{\zeta}}d\zeta = \sqrt{z(1-z)} + \tan^{-1}\sqrt{\frac{z}{1-z}}, \quad (11) \\ \eta &= (\mu p)^{1/4}y = z^{\frac{N-1}{4}}(1-z)^{\frac{9-N}{4}}y, \\ \hat{f} &= p^{1/4}\mu^{-3/4}f = z^{\frac{3-N}{4}}(1-z)^{\frac{N-11}{4}}f, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} Q &= \frac{p}{\mu}\Big(\frac{q}{p} + \frac{1}{4}\Big(\frac{p'}{p} + \frac{\mu'}{\mu}\Big)' - \frac{1}{16}\Big(\frac{p'}{p} + \frac{\mu'}{\mu}\Big)^2 + \frac{1}{4}\frac{p'}{p}\Big(\frac{p'}{p} + \frac{\mu'}{\mu}\Big)\Big) \\ &= \frac{1}{z(1-z)^3}\Big(\frac{(N-1)(N-3)}{16} + \frac{7-2N}{2}z + 2z^2\Big). \end{aligned}$$

Putting

$$\xi_R := \int_0^{1-\frac{1}{R}} \sqrt{\frac{1-z}{z}}dz,$$

we see the variable ξ runs over the inetrval $[0, \xi_R]$. Since $z \sim \dfrac{\xi^2}{4}$ as $\xi \to 0$, we see

$$Q \sim \frac{(N-1)(N-3)}{4}\frac{1}{\xi^2}$$

as $\xi \to 0$. But $\gamma < 2$ implies $N > 4$ and $\dfrac{(N-1)(N-3)}{4} > \dfrac{3}{4}$. Hence the boundary $\xi = 0$ is of the limit point type. See, e.g., [4], p.159, Theorem X.10. The exceptional case $\gamma = 2$ or $N = 4$ will be considered separately. Thus we have

Proposition 1 *The operator* $T_0, \mathcal{D}(T_0) = C_0^\infty(0, \xi_R), T_0\eta = -\eta_{\xi\xi} + Q\eta$, *in* $L^2(0, \xi_R)$ *has the Friedrichs extension* T*, a self-adjoint operator whose spectrum consists of simple eigenvalues* $\lambda_1 R^3 < \lambda_2 R^3 < \cdots < \lambda_n R^3 < \cdots \to +\infty$.

In other words, *the operator* $A_0, \mathcal{D}(A_0) = C_0^\infty(0, 1-\frac{1}{R}), A_0 y = \mathcal{L}y$ *in* $\mathfrak{X} := L^2((0, 1-\frac{1}{R}), \mu dz (= z^{\frac{N-2}{2}}(1-z)^{\frac{10-N}{2}}dz))$*, has the Friedrichs extension* A*, a self-adjoint operator with the eigenvalues* $(\lambda_n)_n$.

We note that the domain of A is

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{D}(A) \quad = \quad & \{y \in \mathfrak{X} \mid \exists \phi_n \in C_0^\infty(0, 1-\frac{1}{R}) \\ & \text{such that } \phi_n \to y \text{ in } \mathfrak{X} \text{ and } \mathfrak{Q}[\phi_m - \phi_n] \to 0 \text{ as } m, n \to \infty, \\ & \text{and } \mathcal{L}y \in \mathfrak{X} \text{ in distribution sense.}\}\end{aligned}$$

Here

$$\begin{aligned}\mathfrak{Q}[\phi] := \quad & \int_0^{1-\frac{1}{R}} \left|\frac{d\phi}{dz}\right|^2 z^{\frac{N}{2}}(1-z)^{\frac{8-N}{2}}dz \\ = & \int_0^{1-\frac{1}{R}} \frac{z}{1-z}\left|\frac{d\phi}{dz}\right|^2 \mu(z)dz.\end{aligned}$$

Moreover we have

Proposition 2 *If* $N \leq 8$ *(or* $\gamma \geq 4/3$ *), the least eigenvalue* λ_1 *is positive.*

Proof: Suppose $N \leq 8$. Clearly $y \equiv 1$ satisfies

$$-\frac{d}{dz}p\frac{dy}{dz} + qy = q = \frac{8-N}{2}z^{\frac{N-2}{2}}(1-z)^{\frac{4-N}{2}}.$$

Therefore the corresponding $\eta_1(\xi)$ given by

$$\eta_1 = z^{\frac{N-1}{4}}(1-z)^{\frac{9-N}{4}}$$

satisfies

$$-\frac{d^2\eta_1}{d\xi^2} + Q\eta = \hat{q} = \frac{8-N}{2}z^{\frac{N-1}{4}}(1-z)^{-\frac{N+3}{4}}.$$

It is easy to see $\eta_1 = \dfrac{d\eta_1}{d\xi} = 0$ at $\xi = 0$. Let $\phi_1(\xi)$ be the eigenfunction of $-d^2/d\xi^2 + Q$ associated with the least eigenvalue λ_1. We can assume that $\phi_1(\xi) > 0$ for $0 < \xi < \xi_R, \phi_1(\xi_R) = 0$, and $\dfrac{d\phi_1}{d\xi} < 0$ at $\xi = \xi_R$. Then integrations by parts gives

$$\begin{aligned}
\lambda_1 \int_0^{\xi_R} \phi_1\eta_1 d\xi &= \int_0^{\xi_R} \Big(-\frac{d^2\phi_1}{d\xi^2} + Q\phi_1 \Big)\eta_1 d\xi \\
&= -\frac{d\phi_1}{d\xi}\eta_1\Big|_{\xi=\xi_R} + \int_0^{\xi_R} \Big(\frac{d\phi_1}{d\xi}\frac{d\eta_1}{d\xi} + Q\phi_1\eta_1 \Big) d\xi \\
&> \int_0^{\xi_R} \Big(\frac{d\phi_1}{d\xi}\frac{d\eta_1}{d\xi} + Q\phi_1\eta_1 \Big) d\xi \\
&= \int_0^{\xi_R} \phi_1 \Big(-\frac{d^2\eta_1}{d\xi^2} + Q\eta_1 \Big) d\xi \\
&= \int_0^{\xi_R} \phi_1 \hat{q} d\xi \geq 0.
\end{aligned}$$

■

Remark: When $N = 8$, η_1 satisfies $-\dfrac{d^2\eta}{d\xi^2} + Q\eta = 0$, but does not satisfy the boundary condition $\eta|_{\xi=\xi_R} = 0$. Hence it is not an eigenfunction of zero eigenvalue, and $\lambda_1 > 0$ even if $N = 8$.

2.3

For the sake of convenience of the further analysis, let us rewrite the linear part $\mathcal{L}$ by introducing a new variable

$$\tilde{x} = \frac{\xi^2}{4} = \frac{1}{4}\Big(\sqrt{z(1-z)} + \tan^{-1}\sqrt{\frac{z}{1-z}}\Big)^2.$$

Clearly $\tilde{x} = z + [z]_2$ and the change of variables $z \mapsto \tilde{x}$ is analytic on $0 \le z < 1$ and its inverse $\tilde{x} \mapsto z$ is analytic on $0 \le \tilde{x} < \pi^2/16$. Since

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{d}{dz} &= \sqrt{\frac{\tilde{x}}{z}}\sqrt{1-z}\frac{d}{d\tilde{x}}, \\
\frac{d^2}{dz^2} &= \frac{1-z}{z}\Big(\tilde{x}\frac{d^2}{d\tilde{x}^2} + \frac{1}{2}\Big(1 - \sqrt{\frac{\tilde{x}}{z}}\frac{1}{(1-z)\sqrt{1-z}}\Big)\frac{d}{d\tilde{x}}\Big), \\
\sqrt{\frac{\tilde{x}}{z}} &= 1 + [\tilde{x}]_1,
\end{aligned}$$

we can write

$$R^3\mathcal{L}y = -\Big(\tilde{x}\frac{d^2y}{d\tilde{x}^2} + \frac{N}{2}\frac{dy}{d\tilde{x}}\Big) + \ell_1(\tilde{x})\tilde{x}\frac{dy}{d\tilde{x}} + \ell_0(\tilde{x})y,$$

where $\ell_1(\tilde{x})$ and $\ell_0(\tilde{x})$ are analytic on $0 \le \tilde{x} < \pi^2/16$. Putting

$$x = R^3\tilde{x} = \frac{R^3\xi^2}{4} = \frac{R^3}{4}\Big(\sqrt{z(1-z)} + \tan^{-1}\sqrt{\frac{z}{1-z}}\Big)^2, \tag{12}$$

we can write

$$\mathcal{L}y = -\triangle y + L_1(x)x\frac{dy}{dx} + L_0(x)y, \tag{13}$$

where

$$\triangle = x\frac{d^2}{dx^2} + \frac{N}{2}\frac{d}{dx}$$

and $L_1(x)$ and $L_0(x)$ are analytic on $0 \le x < \pi^2R^3/16$. While r runs over the interval $[1, R]$, x runs over $[0, x_R]$, where $x_R := R^3\xi_R^2/4 (< \pi^2R^3/16)$. The Dirichlet condition at the regular boundary is $y|_{x=x_R} = 0$.

Remark: Since $x = R^3\xi^2/4$, we have

$$\triangle = x\frac{d^2}{dx^2} + \frac{N}{2}\frac{d}{dx} = \frac{1}{R^3}\Big(\frac{d^2}{d\xi^2} + \frac{N-1}{\xi}\frac{d}{d\xi}\Big).$$

Thus $\triangle$ is the radial part of the Laplacian in the N-dimensional Euclidean space $\mathbb{R}^N$ provided that N is an integer. But we do not assume that N is an integer in this study.

2.4

Let us fix an eigenvalue $\lambda = \lambda_n$ and an associated eigenfunction $\Phi(x)$ of $\mathcal{L}$. Then

$$y_1(t,x) = \sin\sqrt{\lambda}(t-t_0)\Phi(x) \tag{14}$$

is a time-periodic solution of the linearized problem

$$\frac{\partial^2 y}{\partial t^2} + \mathcal{L}y = 0, \qquad y|_{x=x_R} = 0.$$

Moreover we claim that $\Phi(x)$ is an analytic function of $|x| < \pi^2 R^3/16$. To verify it, we use the following

Lemma 1 *We consider the differential equation*

$$x\frac{d^2y}{dx^2} + b(x)\frac{dy}{dx} + c(x)y = 0,$$

where

$$b(x) = \beta + [x]_1, \qquad c(x) = [x]_0,$$

and we assume that $\beta \geq 2$. *Then 1) there is a solution* y_1 *of the form*

$$y_1 = 1 + [x]_1,$$

and 2) there is a solution y_2 *such that*

$$y_2 = x^{-\beta+1}(1+[x]_1)$$

provided that $\beta \notin \mathbb{N}$ *or*

$$y_2 = x^{-\beta+1}(1+[x]_1) + hy_1\log x$$

provided that $\beta \in \mathbb{N}$. *Here* h *is a constant which can vanish in some cases.*

For a proof, see [1], Chapter 4. Applying this lemma with $\beta = N/2$ to the equation

$$x\frac{d^2y}{dx^2} + \Big(\frac{N}{2} - L_1(x)x\Big)\frac{dy}{dx} + (\lambda - L_0(x))y = 0,$$

we get the assertion, since $y_2 \sim x^{-\frac{N-2}{2}}$ cannot belong to $\mathfrak{X} = L^2(x^{\frac{N-2}{2}}dx)$ for $N \geq 4$, even if $N = 4$, which was the exceptional case in the preceding discussion of the limit point type.

3 Statement of the main result

3.1

We rewrite the equation (5) by using the linearized part $\mathcal{L}$ defined by (7) as

$$\frac{\partial^2 y}{\partial t^2}+\Big(1+G_I\Big(y,r\frac{\partial y}{\partial r}\Big)\Big)\mathcal{L}y+G_{II}\Big(r,y,r\frac{\partial y}{\partial r}\Big)=0, \tag{15}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
G_I(y,v) &= (1+y)^2\Big(1+\frac{1}{\gamma}\partial_v G_2(y,v)\Big)-1,\\
G_{II}(r,y,v) &= \frac{P}{\rho r^2}G_{II0}(y,v)+\frac{1}{\gamma-1}\frac{1}{r^3}G_{II1}(y,v),\\
G_{II0}(y,v) &= (1+y)^2(3\partial_v G_2-\partial_y G_2)v,\\
G_{II1}(y,v) &= (1+y)^2\Big(\frac{1}{\gamma}(\partial_v G_2)((4-3\gamma)y-\gamma v)+G_2\Big)-H+4y(1+y)^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Here

$$\begin{aligned}
G_2 &:= G-\gamma(3y+v)=[y,v]_2,\\
\partial_v G_2 &:= \frac{\partial}{\partial v}G_2=\frac{\partial G}{\partial v}-\gamma=[y,v]_1\\
\partial_y G_2 &:= \frac{\partial}{\partial y}G_2=\frac{\partial G}{\partial y}-3\gamma=[y,v]_1
\end{aligned}$$

We have fixed a solution y_1 of the linearized equation $y_{tt}+\mathcal{L}y=0$ (see (14)), and we seek a solution y of (5) or (15) of the form

$$y=\varepsilon y_1+\varepsilon w,$$

where ε is a small positive parameter. Then the equation which governs w turns out to be

$$\frac{\partial^2 w}{\partial t^2}+\Big(1+\varepsilon a(t,r,w,r\frac{\partial w}{\partial r},\varepsilon)\Big)\mathcal{L}w+\varepsilon b(t,r,w,r\frac{\partial w}{\partial r},\varepsilon)=\varepsilon c(t,r,\varepsilon), \tag{16}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
a(t,r,w,\Omega,\varepsilon) &= \varepsilon^{-1}G_I(\varepsilon(y_1+w),\varepsilon(v_1+\Omega)),\\
b(t,r,w,\Omega,\varepsilon) &= \varepsilon^{-1}G_I(\varepsilon(y_1+w),\varepsilon(v_1+\Omega))\mathcal{L}y_1+\varepsilon^{-2}G_{II}(\varepsilon(y_1+w),\varepsilon(v_1+\Omega))\\
&\quad -\varepsilon^{-1}G_I(\varepsilon y_1,\varepsilon v_1)\mathcal{L}y_1-\varepsilon^{-2}G_{II}(\varepsilon y_1,\varepsilon v_1),\\
c(t,r,\varepsilon) &= \varepsilon^{-1}G_I(\varepsilon y_1,\varepsilon v_1)\mathcal{L}y_1+\varepsilon^{-2}G_{II}(\varepsilon y_1,\varepsilon v_1).
\end{aligned}$$

Here v_1 stands for $r\partial y_1/\partial r$.

The property of the trouble which comes from the free boundary touching the vacuum is same as that of the case of one-dimensional motions studied in [3]. Namely, because of loss of regularities at $r = R$, the usual iteration does not work for the equation (16), which is not quasi-linear despite appearances. So, we should employ the Nash-Moser theorem.

Then the main result of this study can be stated as follows:

Theorem 1 *For any $T > 0$, there is a sufficiently small positive $\varepsilon_0(T)$ such that, for $0 < \varepsilon \leq \varepsilon_0(T)$, there is a solution w of (16) such that $w \in C^\infty([0,T] \times [1,R])$ and*

$$\sup_{j+k\leq n} \Big\| \Big(\frac{\partial}{\partial t}\Big)^j \Big(\frac{\partial}{\partial r}\Big)^k w \Big\|_{L^\infty([0,T]\times[1,R])} \leq C_n \varepsilon,$$

or a solution $y \in C^\infty([0,T] \times [1,R])$ of (5) or (15) of the form

$$y(t,r) = \varepsilon y_1(t,r) + O(\varepsilon^2),$$

or a motion which can be expressed by the Lagrangian coordinate as

$$r(t,m) = \bar{r}(m)(1 + \varepsilon y_1(t, \bar{r}(m)) + O(\varepsilon^2))$$

for $0 \leq t \leq T, 0 \leq m \leq M$.

Remark. The corresponding density distribution $\rho = \rho(t,r)$, where r is the original Euler coordinate, satisfies

$$\rho(t,r) > 0 \text{ for } 1 \leq r < R_F(t), \qquad \rho(t,r) = 0 \text{ for } R_F(t) \leq r,$$

where

$$R_F(t) := r(t,M) = R + \varepsilon R \sin\sqrt{\lambda}(t - t_0)\Phi(0) + O(\varepsilon^2).$$

Since $y(t,r)$ is smooth on $1 \leq r \leq R$, we have

$$\rho(t,r) = C(t)(R_F(t) - r)^{\frac{1}{\gamma-1}}(1 + O(R_F(t) - r))$$

as $r \to R_F(t) - 0$. Here $C(t)$ is positive and smooth in t.

3.2

Our task is to find the inverse image $\mathfrak{P}^{-1}(\varepsilon c)$ of the nonlinear mapping $\mathfrak{P}$ defined by

$$\mathfrak{P}(w) = \frac{\partial^2 w}{\partial t^2} + (1+\varepsilon a)\mathcal{L}w + \varepsilon b. \tag{17}$$

Let us note that $\mathfrak{P}(0) = 0$. This task, which will be done by applying the Nash- Moser theorem, will require a certain property of the derivative of $\mathfrak{P}$:

$$D\mathfrak{P}(w)h = \frac{\partial^2 h}{\partial t^2} + (1+\varepsilon a_1)\mathcal{L}h + \varepsilon a_{21} r\frac{\partial h}{\partial r} + \varepsilon a_{20}h, \tag{18}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} a_1 &= a(t, r, w, r\frac{\partial w}{\partial r}, \varepsilon), \\ a_{10} &= \frac{\partial a}{\partial w}\mathcal{L}w + \frac{\partial b}{\partial w}, \\ a_{21} &= \frac{\partial a}{\partial \Omega}\mathcal{L}w + \frac{\partial b}{\partial \Omega}. \end{aligned}$$

Here Ω is the dummy of $r\dfrac{\partial w}{\partial r}$. The following observation will play a crucial role in energy eatimates later.

Lemma 2 *We have*

$$a_{21} = \frac{\gamma P}{\rho}(1+y)^{-2\gamma+2}(1+y+v)^{-\gamma-2}\Big((\gamma+1)\frac{\partial^2 Y}{\partial r^2} + \frac{4\gamma}{r}\frac{\partial Y}{\partial r} + \frac{2\varepsilon(\gamma-1)}{1+y}\Big(\frac{\partial Y}{\partial r}\Big)^2\Big),$$

where

$$y = \varepsilon(y_1 + w), \qquad v = r\frac{\partial y}{\partial r}, \qquad Y = y_1 + w.$$

Proof: It is easy to se

$$\begin{aligned} a_{21} &= (\partial_v G_I)\mathcal{L}Y + \varepsilon^{-1}\partial_v G_{II} \\ &= (\partial_v G_I)\Big(-\frac{\gamma P}{\rho r}(3Y+V)'\Big) + \varepsilon^{-1}\frac{P}{\rho r^2}\partial_v G_{II0} + \frac{1}{\gamma-1}\frac{1}{r^3}[U], \end{aligned}$$

where

$$[U] = \gamma(\partial_v G_I)(3Y+V) + \partial_v G_I(-4Y) + \varepsilon^{-1}\partial_v G_{II1}.$$

Using

$$\partial_v G_I = (1+y)^2 \frac{1}{\gamma} \partial_v^2 G_2,$$

we can show that $[U] = 0$. Then a direct calculation leads us to the conclusion. ■

4 Proof of the main result

The proof of the main result is almost same as the discussion developed in [3], Section 4. We use the variable x defined by (8), (12) from r, and this x plays the role of the variable z in [3]. We note that

$$\begin{aligned} x &= R^2(R-r) + [R-r]_2, \\ \frac{\partial}{\partial r} &= -R^2(1+[x]_1))\frac{\partial}{\partial x}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore a function of $1 \leq r \leq R$ which is infinetely many times continuously differentiable is also so as a function of $0 \leq x \leq x_R$. Therefore we apply the Nash-Moser theorem ([2], p.171, III.1.1.1) to the space of functions of t and x:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{E} &:= C^\infty([0,T] \times [0, x_R]), \\ \mathfrak{E}_0 &:= \{w \in \mathfrak{E} \mid w|_{t=0} = w_t|_{t=0} = 0, \quad w|_{x=x_R} = 0\}. \end{aligned}$$

The nonlinear mapping $\mathfrak{P}$ maps $\mathfrak{E}_0$ into $\mathfrak{E}$.

On $\mathfrak{E}(\supset \mathfrak{E}_0)$ we consider the equivalent gradings of norms:

$$\begin{aligned} \|y\|_n^{(\infty)} &:= \sup_{0\leq j+k\leq n} \Big\| \Big(-\frac{\partial^2}{\partial t^2}\Big)^j (-\triangle)^k y \Big\|_{L^\infty([0,T]\times[0,x_R])}, \\ \|y\|_n^{(2)} &:= \Big(\sum_{0\leq j+k\leq n} \int_0^T \Big\| \Big(-\frac{\partial^2}{\partial t^2}\Big)^j (-\triangle)^k y \Big\|_{\mathfrak{X}}^2 dt \Big)^{1/2}. \end{aligned}$$

Here $y \in \mathfrak{E}$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, and $\mathfrak{X} = L^2([0,x_R], x^{\frac{N}{2}-1}dx)$. Then $\mathfrak{E}$ and it closed subspace $\mathfrak{E}_0$ are tame spaces. The mapping $\mathfrak{P}$ is tame thanks to the following

Proposition 3 *For any $m \in \mathbb{N}$ we have the formula*

$$\triangle^m D w(x) = x^{-\frac{N}{2}-m} \int_0^x \triangle^{m+1} w(x')(x')^{\frac{N}{2}+m-1} dx',$$

and

$$\|(-\triangle)^m D^k w\|_{L^\infty} \leq \frac{1}{\prod_{j=0}^{k-1}(\frac{N}{2}+m+j)}\|(-\triangle)^{m+k}w\|_{L^\infty}.$$

Here $D = d/dx$.

Therefore the problem is concentrated to energy estimates in the space $\mathfrak{X}$ of the solution and its higher derivatives of the linear equation

$$D\mathfrak{P}(w)h = g,$$

when w is fixed in $\mathfrak{E}_0$. Let us investigate the structure of the linear operator $D\mathfrak{P}(w)$.

First we note that

$$\frac{\gamma P}{\rho} = \frac{1}{r} - \frac{1}{R} = \frac{x}{R^3}(1+[x]_1).$$

Therefore it follows from Lemma 2 that there exists a smooth function $\hat{a}(t,x)$ such that

$$\varepsilon a_{21} r\frac{\partial}{\partial r} = \varepsilon \hat{a}(t,x)x\frac{\partial}{\partial x}.$$

Let us put

$$\begin{aligned} b_1 &:= (1+\varepsilon a_1)L_1(x) + \varepsilon\hat{a}, \\ b_0 &:= (1+\varepsilon a_1)L_0(x) + \varepsilon a_{20}, \end{aligned}$$

taking into account the observation in Section 2.3, (13).

Then we can write

$$D\mathfrak{P}(w)h = \frac{\partial^2 h}{\partial t^2} - (1+\varepsilon a_1)\triangle h + b_1(t,x)x\frac{\partial h}{\partial x} + b_0(t,x)h.$$

We note that b_1, b_0 depends only on $w, \partial w/\partial x, \partial^2 w/\partial x^2$. Then we can claim that the solution of $D\mathfrak{P}(w)h = g$ enjoys the energy estimate

$$\|h_t\|_{\mathfrak{X}} + \|\dot{D}h\|_{\mathfrak{X}} + \|h\|_{\mathfrak{X}} \leq C \sup_{0\leq t\leq T}\|g(t)\|_{\mathfrak{X}},$$

where $\dot{D} = \sqrt{x}\partial/\partial x$ and C depends only on

$$A = \|\varepsilon a_{1,t}\|_{L^\infty} + \sqrt{2}\|\varepsilon\dot{D}a_1 + b_1\|_{L^\infty}$$

and

$$B = \|b_0\|_{L^\infty}.$$

A proof can be found in [3]. Similarly the higher derivatives $H_m = \triangle^m h$ satisfy the equations

$$(H_m)_{tt} - (1 + \varepsilon a_1)\triangle H_m + b_1^{(m)}\check{D}H_m + b_0^{(m)}H_m = F_m,$$

where $\check{D} = x\partial/\partial x$ and

$$F_m = \triangle^m g + \sum_{j=0}^{m-1}(c_{1j}^{(m)}\check{D}H_j + c_{0j}^{(m)}H_j).$$

The recurrence formula to determine the coefficients $b_1^{(m)}, b_0^{(m)}$ is the same as in [3]. But the initial condition is, for the present case,

$$b_1^{(0)} = b_1, \qquad b_0^{(0)} = b_0.$$

The solution is

$$\begin{aligned}
b_1^{(m)} &= -2mD(\varepsilon a_1) + b_1,\\
b_0^{(m)} &= (-m\triangle - m(m-1)(1 + 2\check{D})D)(\varepsilon a_1) + m(1 + 2\check{D})b_1 + b_0\\
&= -m((2m-1)\triangle + (m-1)(1-N)D)(\varepsilon a_1) + m(1 + 2\check{D})b_1 + b_0.
\end{aligned}$$

The coefficients $\gamma_{0k}^{(m)} = c_{0,m-k}^{(m)}, \gamma_{1k}^{(m)} = c_{1,m-k}^{(m)}$ are determined by starting from

$$\gamma_{11}^{(1)} = (-\triangle + N - 2)b_1, \qquad \gamma_{01}^{(1)} = -\triangle b_0,$$

through the recurrence formula

$$\begin{aligned}
\gamma_{1k}^{(m+1)} &= \gamma_{1k}^{(m)} + (\triangle - (N-2)D)\gamma_{1,k-1}^{(m)} + 2D\gamma_{0,k-1}^{(m)} \text{ for } 2 \le k\\
\gamma_{11}^{(m+1)} &= \gamma_{11}^{(m)} - (\triangle - (N-2)D)b_1^{(m)} - 2Db_0^{(m)} =\\
&= \gamma_{11}^{(m)} + 4m^2(\triangle + \frac{3-N}{2}D)D(\varepsilon a_1) +\\
&+ (-(4m+1)\triangle + (2mN - 6m + N - 2)D)b_1 - 2Db_0\\
\gamma_{0k}^{(m+1)} &= \gamma_{0k}^{(m)} + (1 + 2\check{D})\gamma_{1,k-1}^{(m)} + \triangle\gamma_{0,k-1}^{(m)} \text{ for } 2 \le k\\
\gamma_{01}^{(m+1)} &= \gamma_{01}^{(m)} - \triangle b_0^{(m)} + (1 + 2\check{D})\gamma_{11}^{(m)} =\\
&= \gamma_{01}^{(m)} + m\triangle((2m-1)\triangle + (m-1)(1-N)D)(\varepsilon a_1) +\\
&\quad -m(3 + 2\check{D})\triangle b_1 - \triangle b_0 + (1 + 2\check{D})\gamma_{11}^{(m)}
\end{aligned}$$

Thus if we put

$$\vec{A} = (Da_1, \triangle a_1, (\triangle + \frac{3-N}{2}D)Da_1, Db_1, \triangle b_1, Db_0, \triangle b_0),$$

we can show that

$$\|\gamma_{1k}^{(m)}\|_0 + \|\gamma_{0k}^{(m)}\|_0 \leq C\|\vec{A}\|_k.$$

Here

$$\|y\|_\ell = \sup_{0\leq t\leq T}\sup_{0\leq j\leq \ell} \|(-\triangle)^j y\|_{L^\infty}.$$

This implies the estimate

$$\|\check{D}H_m\|_{\mathfrak{X}} + \|H_m\|_{\mathfrak{X}} \leq C(\|g\|_m + \|\vec{A}\|_m),$$

where C depends only on

$$\begin{aligned} A_m &= \|\varepsilon a_{1,t}\|_{L^\infty} + \sqrt{2}\|\varepsilon \dot{D}a_1 + b_1^{(m)}\|_{L^\infty}, \\ B_m &= \|b_0^{(m)}\|_{L^\infty}, \end{aligned}$$

which do not contain the higher order derivatives of w. This is the required tame estimate of the inverse of $D\mathfrak{P}(w)$.

The proof performed in [3] can be applied directly to the present case. This completes the proof of main result.

References

[1] E. A. Coddington and N. Levinson, Theory od Ordinary Differential Equations, McGraw-Hill, 1955

[2] R. Hamilton, The inverse function theorem of Nash and Moser, Bull. American Math. Soc., 7 (1982), 65-222

[3] C.-H. Hsu, S.-S. Lin, T. Makino and C.-R. Yang, An application of Nash-Moser theorem to smooth solutions of one-dimensional compressible Euler equations with gravity, preprint, arXiv:1208.3732

[4] M. Reed and B. Simon, Methods of Modern Mathematical Physics, Vol.II: Fourier Analysis, Self-Adjointness, Academic Press, 1975

nuna adreso:
Tetu Makino
Department of Applied Mathematics, Faculty of Engineering,
Yamaguchi University,
Ube 755-8611, Japan
E-mail: makino@yamaguchi-u.ac.jp